8th December 1959]

Sri R. KRISHNASAMI NAIDU : கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, நம்முடைய ராஜ்யத்திலே பெண்களுக்கென்று ஆதாரக் கல்விப் பள்ளிகள் மிகவும் குறைவாக இருக்கிற காரணத்தினால் அவைகளை அதிகப்படுத்துவதற்கு அரசாங்கம் என்ன ஏற்பாடுகளைச் செய்துவருகிறது என்று அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

The Hon. Sri C. SUBRAMANIAM : இது கல்லூரியைப் பொறுத்தது. பள்ளிகளைப் பொறுத்து தனிக் கேள்வி போட வேண்டும்.

Sri A. VEDARATHNAM : ஓரத்தநாட்டில் இருக்கிற ஆதாரக் கல்லூரிக்கு யூனிவர்ஸிடி அங்கீகாரம் கிடைத்துவிட்டதா ?

The Hon. Sri C. SUBRAMANIAM : Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER : Questions are over.

[*Note*.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—ANNOUNCEMENT.

BILL.

Mr. SPEAKER : I have to announce to the House that the Governor has given his recommendation for the introduction of the Madras General Sales Tax (Turnover and Assessment) Rules Validation and General Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 1959, in the Assembly.

III.—POINT OF ORDER *RE* TRANSACTION OF OTHER BUSINESS AFTER THE GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS AND BEFORE THE DISCUSSION THEREON.

Mr. SPEAKER : The Hon. Minister for Finance will now move his motion.

Sri M. KALYANASUNDARAM : On a point of order, Sir. We are now continuing the debate on the Governor's Address. Yesterday the Hon. the Leader of the House intervened and I raised a point of order and if I had understood your ruling on that correctly, I think you held that Government business could be taken up before the debate starts but not in the middle. Whatever may be the importance of the Governor's Address as such, I attach great importance to the debate on the Governor's Address because it concerns the policy of the Ministry. So may I know whether such intervention by the Hon. the Finance Minister is permissible unless it is very extraordinary? I think introduction is only just a routine matter.

The Hon. Sri C. SUBRAMANIAM : I think the Hon. Speaker had given a ruling on the matter yesterday and that the hon. Member also understood it correctly. But I find now he is making a distinction between the first day's debate and the second day's debate. No such distinction can be made.

Mr. SPEAKER : I am glad the hon. Member raised the point. Though it may be of academic interest only. I think it may be of guidance for the future also. There is a precedent for this in the Lok Sabha. On the 15th February 1956 the President

delivered his Address. But on account of certain very important business, the proceedings were interrupted and there was a discussion on an adjournment motion as well. Then there was discussion on a number of Bills, for example, Validation of the State Laws Bill, the Indian Red Cross Bill, the Representation of the People Amendment Bill and the discussion on the President's Address started only on the 20th February, after an interval of five days.

Now, the hon. Member has made a subtle distinction, which was correctly put by the Hon. the Finance Minister, namely, whether in the middle of the discussion, such interruption by Government or other business can take place. I think it can take place because there has been a precedent for this matter also. In the Madras Assembly itself, in the year 1958, while the Governor's Address was being discussed in the middle of it, the hon. Member Sri A. Govindaswamy, presented a petition to the Assembly and then the same Member called attention to a matter of urgent public importance. Then the Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu moved a motion asking for leave to introduce the Madras Cultivating Tenants' Protection Bill. In the Lok Sabha not only was the Bill introduced, but also the discussion on the Bill took place and the Bill was passed. They had gone a stage further than what we had done here.

Therefore, there is nothing to prevent all these taking place before the resumption of the discussion on the Governor's Address. I have quoted a precedent to show that in the middle of the discussion on the Address there has been other matter discussed.

The point raised by the hon. Member will be relevant only to the extent whether the Bill is so urgent as to warrant its introduction today, or whether the Finance Minister could not have introduced it yesterday or postponed it to a later stage. This is a matter of opinion. The Finance Minister could have introduced it yesterday. But probably he was awaiting the Governor's recommendation. That might be his reason for introducing it today. Anyway for future guidance at least this ruling could be used. Today, I think, we are in order in taking up this business before we resume discussion on the Governor's Address.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : So Members could move adjournment motions and rule 41 motions.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, but after the clarification, whether the Speaker is going to allow them or not is a different matter. There is nothing to prevent the moving of such motions. But I will give my decision on the merits of each case. I suppose the hon. Member is satisfied.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : The Hon. Finance Minister may now move his motion.